

Ravalli County Planning Board
Meeting Minutes for October 17, 2007
3:00 p.m.
Commissioners Meeting Room, 215 S. 4th Street, Hamilton, Montana

Plat Evaluation
Market Place II (Nelson) Major Subdivision

Public Meeting
Update on Countywide Zoning Project

1. Call to order: Chip Pigman

Meeting called to order at 3:10 PM

2. Roll Call

(A) Members present (See Attachment A, Roll Call Sheet)

Mary Lee Bailey (present)
Dale Brown (present)
Phil Connelly (absent – unexcused)
Ben Hillicoss (present)
Dan Huls (excused)
JR Iman (excused)
Lee Kierig (present)
Chip Pigman (present)

Park Board Representative: Bob Cron (present)

(B) Staff

Kimberli Imig
Shaun Morrell
Tristan Riddell
John Lavey

3. Approval of Minutes:

Chip asked if there were any corrections or additions to the minutes from August 15, 2007. There were none. The minutes were approved.

3. Amendments to the Agenda

None

4. Correspondence

None

5. Disclosure of Possible/Perceived Conflicts

None

6. Plat Evaluation

Market Place II (MAN Enterprises, LLC) Major Subdivision

- (i) Presentation by Terry Nelson, Applebury Survey – (See Attachment B, Subdivision Questionnaire, Ravalli County, Montana)
- The proposal is for 31 Lots on approximately 10 acres
 - This subdivision was party to the Lords, et. al. settlement agreement, thus none of the lots meet the two acre minimum specified in the interim zoning (Resolution 2038)
 - This subdivision fits with the other developments around it and will hook into Corvallis Sewer
 - The subject property is located off Market St. South, which is currently a private easement.
 - Roads within the proposed subdivision will be looped into subdivision that already exists at Jessica Ct.
 - There are prime agricultural soils on the subject property, but because of the ability to hook up to Corvallis' Sewer, it seems to be ok, Terry reported.
 - There area no irrigation ditches or water rights on the property.
 - No major wildlife. There are some deer, but no species of special concern as identified by the Montana Heritage Program.
 - The primary subdivision access will connect directly to Eastside Highway.

- (ii) Public comment

There was none.

- (iii) Board discussion and questions

Ben asked if the subdivision will have sidewalks.

Terry stated that there are no sidewalks proposed at this time.

Ben asked where is the nearest place to connect to a bike path was in the area.

Terry stated that there is a bike path along Woodside Cutoff, but there has been some discussion about doing a separate bike path within the subdivision as well.

Lee asked if there were any curbs, sidewalks, or gutters. He stated that there is only so much room for the right of way.

Terry stated that those would probably come into play later.

Ben said that it is important to have the sidewalks, gutters, and curbs in the beginning, because people would rather pay at the beginning when purchasing the house than later when the subdivision is established.

Terry agreed with what both Lee and Ben were saying and said that it would be looked into.

Bob stated that he is pretty sure that the Park Board agreed to cash-in-lieu.

Terry said that is correct.

Mary Lee just wanted to reiterate that having a bike path is very important, especially in this area.

8. **Public Meeting: Update on Countywide Zoning Project**

Shaun gave an overview of the progress of the Countywide Zoning Project (See Attachment C, Countywide Zoning Project: Progress Report to Planning Board and Attachment D, CPC Meetings for October and November)

Bob asked if the Commissioners asked for staff recommendation to extend interim zoning.

Shaun stated that, to his knowledge, the Commissioners did not formally ask for staff recommendation, but that some general discussions had taken place between various County entities.

Lee stated that there were several people talking prior to the meeting, and as Planning Board members they were wondering if there is a protocol for them at CPC Meetings. Lee's idea is that the board members are more of a mentor than a participant.

Shaun said that this is an important role for the board members, so as not to influence the CPC groups one way or another but to be there to answer questions and give guidance.

Mary Lee stated that it is a struggle to get adequate attendance at the CPC meetings. When no one shows up, she has to play a bigger role. Ultimately she feels it comes back to the Board and she really wonders what the exact role is.

Shaun said again that the Board's role is more as a resource for information, and not a member of the CPC group.

Lee stated that the Board should help stimulate the CPC if they get stuck.

Bob stated that it is important that the Board members attend their respective CPC meetings so when it comes to the final project, it is not all brand new to them.

Chip said that it is more like being part of a subcommittee, as opposed to being in the core CPC group.

Ben suggested that Board members act as a bystander, maybe answer some questions and just be a resource.

Chip stated that all are in agreement that there should be some level of involvement, but only as a resource and not a core member.

Ben asked if there is a clear view of what the interface will be in terms of the output of the suitability analysis. For example will there be a GIS map that will show a certain color based on a key saying the suitability analysis in this area ought to be between this and this.

Shaun explained that the model would focus on six areas of interest, taken from the Growth Policy, and would show development suitability on an abstract point scale for one-acre cells throughout the county.

Ben asked if there will be any guidance for density on this map also.

Shaun stated that this is a pretty broad scale from negative 6 to positive 6 meaning that this will bring the abstract and reality together.

Lee stated that from what he is understanding, there will not be density requirements being brought to the table.

Shaun agreed. The map isn't going to say "this zone is zoned for one dwelling per half acre". It will give some guidance to the CPCs, who should use the results to inform their discussion.

Ben stated that he is worried that there will be a drastic difference between what towns think densities should be and what CPCs think densities should be if they are not given any guidance.

Shaun replied that each CPC will be a part of the "countywide roundtable", which will be made up of a representative or two from each CPC. This group will come together and talk about issues of countywide significance, among which includes working with towns. While the local CPCs are meeting twice a month, the roundtable group can meet and bring it all together so things are on the same track.

Lee wondered whether Planning Staff have talked to Joseph Gallagher. He is a Reservoir Resource Engineer getting ready to retire. Joseph has volunteered to do a water quality/quantity study for the Valley. Lee thinks this will be very valuable information.

Shaun stated that, though it would be helpful and valuable, the time frame probably will not allow it – at least for phase 1.

9. **Communications from Staff**

John stated that the resignation of Les Rutledge was given to us this week.

Chip said that Les has moved from Stevensville to Hamilton and there are no at-large positions open on the board so he had to resign. He did state that he would like to continue helping with the Stevi CPC though.

10. **Communications from Public**

There were none.

11. **Communications from Board**

Chip said that he had a couple of things that came to his mind regarding the 1 per 2 extension coming up. He stated that it is just a poor land use planning and personally he does not support it to be in existence for another 12 months. He said that he wished the BCC would use a density tool to make that decision.

Lee stated that he agrees. He also asked if it would be possible for the Planning Board to make a recommendation to the BCC at the 30th at the meeting.

Chip stated that he does not want to shoot down the clustering idea for the next 12 months, but he also does not want that to be the only thing being developed in the next year either.

Lee stated that without some sort of strict code of guidelines, that is going to be difficult to stop.

Ben said he's not sure that the BCC will agree with this, but maybe the Board should recommend something to the BCC. Something regarding density and suitability as opposed to the straight 1 per 2.

Lee agreed and stated that this is a more common approach.

Mary Lee stated that the Bitterrooters for Planning are not going to agree with that. They think they are running the show as it is.

Chip said that this is a better approach to slowing down subdivisions, yet still allowing for decent growth and development.

Bob said that I support what Ben is saying, but politically not sure that it will work. He is also curious how the Board can open dialogue with the BCC.

Ben asked John what he thought, and if there is a way that the Board can convey this message to the BCC.

John agreed that it would be pretty powerful coming from the Planning Board, but was not sure of legalities so asked Alex to join the meeting.

Chip stated the Board's thoughts to Alex, Deputy County Attorney. Chip stated that regarding the meeting on the 30th, we as a board have some thoughts. First, this is lousy land use. Second, can we take a map and draw circles around an area and say this area equals this density, that area equals that density, etc.

Alex said that, because the interim zoning began as a citizen initiated petition, the County is legally obliged to administer the zoning in its current form until November 7, 2007. At that time, they have the option to extend it, or not. If the Commissioners choose to extend it on November 7, 2007, it becomes a County promulgated resolution, at which point they can technically do with it what they want. However, the practical side of the situation is that the Commissioners don't reinterpret or alter the interim zoning.

Ben asked Alex what his perception would be if the Planning Board came forth with some changes, did Alex think the BCC would consider the changes on the 8th then.

Alex stated that yes the BCC could consider the changes, but the question is would they. Because this Resolution was passed by the voters, it is stuck with no modifications until November 7th. On November 8th though modifications can be done. In terms of the density issue and the way things are written right now, there is no current way to modify.

Ben stated that interim zoning initiatives run for one year, and then may be extended one year and then gotten rid of. So if it was modified on November 8th, would it be labeled as something other than Emergency Interim Zoning.

Alex stated that the closer it looks to 1 per 2 the harder the battle to get it through. The circle idea is essentially the same thing as 1 per 2. Circles I can defend, but 1 per whatever acreage is what will be tough.

Ben said so in summary your guidance to us as the Planning Board is do not try to do anything before November 7th.

Alex said that is correct. It also makes me a little nervous trying to get so much done in such a short time.

Dale said that at least we could bring it up to the BCC on the 30th so they are aware at least of what the Board is thinking. Even if the BCC cannot pass it at least they know.

Chip thanked Alex for answering the Board's questions. He also said that he would at least like to get something to the BCC, but that it sounds like that should wait for a couple weeks.

Alex said yes, wait a bit.

Lee then spoke about his handout. (See Attachment E, Public Welfare, Human Responsibility, and Sustainability of Earth)

12. New Business

(A) Discuss and possibly reappoint Vice President to Planning Board

- There was not a quorum so this discussion could not take place on record.

(B) Discussion and Possible Decision to Amend Subdivision Screening Committee Process
(See Attachment F, Ravalli County Planning Board Subdivision Review Process)

- There was not a quorum so this discussion could not take place on record.

13. Old Business

14. Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting: November 20, 2007 at 3:00 PM

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM